

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

October 21, 1986

Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn), chair, convened the session promptly at 6:30 p.m. Present were Senators Amerling, Ballabon, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Binder, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Buianouckas, B. Cohen, Cravzow, Davidson, Donleavy, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Galub, Geach, Gerber, Gluck, Grossfield, Grossman, Hayon, Holland, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Karan, Kirkland, Lea, Lytra, MacLennan, Matthews, McCullers, McDonough, Meyers, Moyne, Muller, Parkhurst, Plissner, Quinn, Rodriguez, Rosen, Rovira, Schlesinger, Seguire, Sheridan, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Taylor, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walter, Wasser, Wedeen, White, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Baker, Blanks, Ginsberg, Linder, Rowan, Sessions, and Youkeles. Senators Bloom, Constantinides, Cooper, Greenbaum, Hernandez-Miyares, La Rubbio, and Picken were excused. Heads of Campus Faculty Governance Bodies Boylan (Queens), Quinn (Brooklyn), and Sohmer (City) and members of Standing Committees of the Senate also attended. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and the Executive Director of the Senate were also present.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: A motion to approve the tentative agenda was made and seconded. There was no discussion and the motion was approved by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 149th Plenary Session (September 23, 1986): A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The following corrections and additions were offered: Professor Simor's absence was excused; Page 5, par. 2, 1.1: "I would like to suggest that new Senators should be better prepared and should be provided with a packet of orientation materials that would include, among other documents, a copy of the Senate Charter and, in addition, an orientation session should be conducted for new Senators...." The minutes were then approved by voice vote.

III. Communications from the Chair: Dr. Wedeen reported as follows. She said that she had attended the 17th Annual Meeting of the Association of Community College Trustees in San Diego from October 15 through 19 and had, therefore, been unable to communicate the events of that event in her written Report that was distributed with the materials at this session. At the meeting she had attended three sessions that she found of particular interest. One was the Academy on State Legislation. Two reports there were especially useful - 1) a proposal pending in Michigan and 2) a contribution of a Florida delegate. The Michigan proposal provided a plan for pre-paid college tuition in the form of a policy that might be secured through the State. The policy might be for tuition at either a public or a private institution or both. An interest-bearing option was available also. Furthermore, the policy was taken at birth. Should the child decide not to attend college the policy could be redeemed. There were additional redemption and conversion options. Although very much discussed both within the State and nationally, the proposal had not yet not been passed by the State Legislature. 2) The Florida delegate's report concerned a number of testing programs. All students entering a community college in the State were required to take an Entrance Examination. A standardized test such as the SAT or ACT was used and was used as an admissions requirement. If a student did not pass the examination, then he/she had to take non-credit remedial work before being granted admission. After a student had been admitted the institution administered the CLAST test - an institutionally developed examination - that had four parts - 1) reading, 2) writing, 3) essay, and 4) computer. Prior to being granted a two-year degree and as an admission requirement for a four year institution, three of the four parts must be passed. Another especially interesting activity is the encouragement of the high schools to give advanced placement courses and for each AP

passed, the high school is given FTE credit.

The second session that Professor Wedeen identified as a highlight of the meeting was the session of The National Council of Occupational Education. CUNY Trustee Lou Cenci gave a paper there on "Private Industry-Public Education: The Humanistic Partnership". He spoke eloquently on the balance between vocational education and the liberal arts and said that the liberal arts must be used as an educational prerequisite and taken in conjunction with vocational courses in the community colleges since training for a specific job is unwise due to the number of career changes that may occur. He suggested that senior colleges should use community college courses for electives in vocational education.

The Roundtable on Presidential Searches was the third session that Chair Wedeen included in her list of principal features of the Meeting. Especially interesting was the panelists' general feeling that CUNY offered a model for others to emulate since the University handled the process so well. Specific noteworthy, they said, was the fact that CUNY included more faculty and student members on its search committees than other institutions among the community colleges represented in the discussion and the fact that CUNY made less use of the AACT than did they. Use of the Association's professional search component is very expensive - some \$12,000 per president on the first round of screening applications and transmitting to the institution those it has found appropriate for the college's consideration.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees and of the Faculty Representative to the CUNY Construction Fund: Professor Wedeen reminded the members that the reports were distributed in writing among the materials for the session. She said that the members and representative would be happy to respond to any questions at this time.

V. Proposed Amendment to the Board of Trustees' Amended Policy Statement on Multiple Positions, October 21, 1981, Calendar No. 6 A, Section 2 c.: Dr. Wedeen introduced Professor Jiji (Engineering, City), member of the Faculty Advisory Council to the Research Foundation and of the Senate Research Committee to present the amendment.

Professor Jiji traced briefly the development of the issue and the Board's 1981 Policy Statement. He explained the difficulties subsequently encountered when one interpretation of that policy was set aside and a different one adopted as the result of a more literal reading of the statement. The present situation, Professor Jiji explained, was that the broader interpretation that permitted researchers and holders of training grants funded through outside funds, i.e. grants to devote up to 3/9 time and receive 3/9 of their academic year salaries in compensation would not be permitted after the summer of 1986. In order to exercise that option it would be necessary for the Senate to bring an amendment to the Board for its approval. Chair Wedeen, Professor Muller, the chair of the Senate Research Committee and also a member of the Faculty Advisory Council, had met with Acting Deputy Chancellor Mucciolo this summer to discuss the issue and the need for prompt Senate action to act on this matter. The Executive Committee, with the assistance of Professors Jiji and Muller had then developed the proposed amendment before the Senate so that the option might be made available once more.

Professor Wedeen then entertained a motion to adopt the proposed amendment which was made and seconded. There were a number of questions and comments, including the reason for the time and compensation being equated to 3/9 of the faculty's academic year salary, the reason for the addition of the phrase on outside funding and the elimination of college approval. All of these were answered satisfactorily. The point was also made that the level of faculty salaries, especially when compared to

those of administrators on the new Executive Pay Scale argued in favor of the amendment and that the desire to attract appropriate faculty to the University and to retain them was frustrated by the present level of faculty compensation.

A question call was adopted by voice vote. The vote on the motion resulted in its unanimous approval.

VI. Chancellor's Report: Professor Wedeen advised the membership that at 2:30 p.m. that afternoon the Chancellor had sent word to her that he could not participate this evening at the agreed hour of 7:30 p.m. but would have to come, if at all, much later due to other commitments. Professor Wedeen had indicated the difficulty in that proposal because of the plan for the session this evening - a plan explained to the Chancellor some time before. Unless she heard further from him or his office, she had informed his office, she would have to assume that he would not report - unless he did, in fact, reach the session by the originally established hour. Since it was now past that hour, she could assume only that he would not report this evening.

VII. New Business: The Chair then asked for any new business. Professor Lea (English, Lehman) spoke to the Chancellor's nonappearance at the session in the context of his failure to meet with the Executive Committee since the opening of the current academic year. He then offered the following motion: "Resolved: That the Senate express its disappointment and displeasure at the Chancellor's failure to meet with the Executive Committee and with the Plenary more often." The motion was seconded.

The discussion included expressions of both support and opposition to the motion and an amendment to delete "displeasure" made and seconded. Discussion of the amendment resulted in its being adopted when the vote on it was taken. Discussion on the principal motion then resumed but was recessed by the arrival of the Chancellor.

VI.(bis) Chancellor's Report: After the Chancellor had been informed of the reasons for the laughter that had greeted him he gave his report. He said that he had only one or two things to report on events that had occurred within the last few days: 1) There is a great enthusiasm for construction. Apparently, the politicians can't wait for the monies since there is an election in November, so they are celebrating in advance. Therefore, the Governor who spoke at the ceremonies there yesterday promised to find the funds for its project - he has come to appreciate the University since assuming office - and we expect to hear something similar tomorrow at York when Mayor Koch and possibly Governor Cuomo are present for the opening of its new facility - the Academic Core that provides the college - at last - with a permanent home. York started without a home and there was a problem of its location. After several proposed locations were proposed it was built where it was needed most. Now it has a new building that is the culmination of twenty years' quest for a permanent home. There should also be some kind of celebration at Staten Island before November 4. We know where the new campus will be and the funds have been set aside so that it will be a breaking ground not a question of whether it is going up or not. The College is awarding an honorary degree to Yuri Orlov at a special convocation Monday and that may be the occasion for the announcement. 2) Since your last meeting Brooklyn College has earned the right to include among its alumni the ninth Nobel Laureate among CUNY undergraduates who have earned that distinction. Until now City, I believe, has led the country in the number of Nobelists it has produced and, if I am correct, the New York City High Schools have produced more than any college in the country. I am certain that you wish to join in the congratulations to Brooklyn of all and I expect that the University will have more Nobelists as time goes on.

There was one issue that arose in Albany last week when I made the yearly trip to present the University's budget to the State Budget Office. There was a question as always about whether the State will have the funds to meet the college requests in spite of the reputed superior condition of the State's economy. I have talked with economists on the faculty and asked their views on the correlation between the availability of

of funds and capital investment and I have told the Governor that the cost of labor is relevant to the quality which is related to education. If the interest lies in economic development, it is related - dependent on - education. There should be an interest in investment in that use. I would welcome your assistance on this issue. The questions on the budget concern child care and graduate education as investments. We have followed SUNY in the emphasis on graduate education, but not the SUNY position. It argues that it is a third rate institution and needs money to strengthen; we, that we are good, but can be great. CUNY is the greatest producer of minority graduate degree holders in the country and the State can't match that achievement. I think it will make an impact - if not in the Governor's office, then in the Legislature.

The Mandatory Retirement Bill, the Chancellor continued, has passed the Congress. There are some complications though because tenured faculty are exempted. I have long argued that if it is to be, then they should have for it all and all professionals should be marked out, e.g. M.D.s. The argument made is that faculty could continue past 70 if the institution so chooses - the problem is that they could do so only at adjunct rates. There was a good House of Representatives bill not a good Senate bill. We will look at the Legislation and prepare a response.

The Council of Presidents' Committee on Drug Education has been established and President Lynch will chair it. I have often wondered whether "Criminal Justice" is a specific category - whether there is a justice for the virtuous and one for the other. In any event Congress has passed legislation for money for this purpose and the State has too and we are going to get a piece of it. We have just avoided a Draconian measure that included the death penalty since it was pulled out by the House at the last minute.

Finally, some of us - I know Professor Wedeen was there - attended the Conference on the Disabled at Queens last Friday. It was a dramatic and moving occasion and I think the University is to be congratulated for taking the lead in providing access and other facilities for the handicapped. Young Kennedy who spoke and who is himself handicapped was impressed, I think. I hope that on some occasion you will invite Vice Chancellor Vivona to speak to you on the budget.

That concludes my remarks, but I will be happy to answer any questions. 1) Professor White (Geology, Hunter) - "A month ago I asked you a question about the lack of timeliness in receiving the increment due us under the collective bargaining agreement and you agreed to find out why this was so. Do you have a response for me?"/ The payroll distributes money for work done, if the increment was to be paid September 1, then it would be approximately September 15, that it was distributed and I believe it was paid then. Professor White further asked - "What concerns me more than money is why it was, as always, that there was a lack of response on campus that could be found that was typical of the lack of answers around there./ The reason for that I cannot give you but I don't think it's wrong to be concerned about the money itself - all of us need to be. 2) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "This year the adjunct money was centralized at 80th Street and distributed there. Was there any faculty involvement in the allocation of those funds?"/ No, I don't think so. Professor Sohmer further asked - "Should it be that way?" 3) Professor Gerber (Comparative Literature, Brooklyn) - "The summer increase in Administrative salaries is the subject of my question. We know that there is a faculty model for salary increases, is there an administrative model as well and does it fail to include any feature without leveling out those increases? This is a question because the budget for that will have an impact on the funds available to the University for other uses."/ Your first question about administrators at 80th Street or the campuses I can answer. There is a model throughout the colleges; at 80th Street the number of administrators has decreased over the last ten years. The number of administrators at a particular institution is related to its function and depends on various parameters. The increase that has taken place is related to the lack of increase over a

period of time. There were caps on their number that were due to various reasons and therefore there was a loss. When they were given the State scale I said that everyone should be paid the same regardless of length of service. Here they are working the same and their requirements are the same. Their pay shouldn't reflect the length of service. I don't want anyone unhappy about money, all of us should get more. But money is not among the things that should contribute to our unhappiness. I would like to see a decrease in work load too. I am interested in this as is the union. It is wrong not believe that if one is paid more, everyone is going to be pulled up. The Chancellor of the California said it is good not bad to do this and in his first year demanded and received a salary above the level that had been paid. In his second year, the Governor increased everyone's salary 14%; thus illustrating the point that if you raise the pay at the administrative level, then the faculty will be pulled up too. If a number of California papers are to be believed, however, he found the weight of the legal requirements burdensome. I regret this because I would like more of this direction for the electorate. 4) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "We are pretty good at generating paper ourselves and distributing it to the campuses. My question concerns articulation. The Executive Committee has tried to make clear the importance of implementing the revised policy on articulation but has failed to impart the history of the meaning of the charge it gives. You made it clear, at least once in meeting with the Committee, that you assigned that policy the highest priority and that principle shouldn't get in the way of making it work. Given the work that must be done expeditiously, could you light a fire under the 80th Street people to get the meetings among faculty across the University provided for in that policy underway?"/ I am committed to its implementation and am lighting fires. 5) Professor Grossman (Education, City) - "I am not certain whether these questions should be put to Vice Chancellor Vivona; so if you do not have the answers, will address them to him. You spoke of childcare and work for the masters for teachers with liberal arts degrees receiving funds and the latter being given tuition-free. Has there been any progress on them?"/ The Union is involved also but I can't respond further. Professor Gluck (Education, Brooklyn) interjected that as an officer of the Union she might report that there is funding for the latter by the Board of Education for programs on several campuses, involving 700 to 800 students. It has begun but not funded through the State Budget Office. 6) Professor Eisenberg (Mathematics - Kingsborough) - "Is there any Board policy that prevents a President from meeting with the AAUP chapter on his campus?"/ No. Professor Eisenberg further asked - "We have asked our President to do so and he has refused because of the Board policy."/ Again, Professor Gluck interjected that there was a relationship between the PSC and the AAUP that says that if something is not on the PSC agenda, therefore the answer is "no". Professor Wedeen interjected that the matter should be referred for consideration and response. The Chancellor then stated that there was a legal contract signed that requires the University to negotiate with the PSC and that the agreement with the AAUP may include a difference that prohibits the President's compliance with the chapter's request. It is a question of what the President is talking to and it may be that there is some ambiguity. So far as administrators and the AAUP are concerned, as a private person, I have been an AAUP member for over 25 years. 7) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "Last time I asked you about the mentally handicapped and what the University was doing to develop a policy for dealing with them. You mentioned a University Task Force and that you had no response then. But you took copious notes and I wondered if you had an answer now?"/ I talked about it and wondered what mentally handicapped means. The best way will be for you to get a letter to me on this outlining the needs not presently met and what recommendations you would make. 8) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "On the decisive issue of administrators there is a tendency to go over our paper work which complicates it. I look at the salary increases and I look at our school and I see four young professors we could hire for one administrator. I would like to see data on the fewer people at 80th Street since that is not so from what I see in the University and Chancellor's Report.

For example, with respect to the Step II grievances I am told there are only two Hearing Officers handling them."/ You state my problem well. I am told that we have too many administrators and that we need more. Professor Bohigian interjected - "We need to readjust the assignments."/ The numbers are due to a given. It is due to the nature of the institution, its demands, etc. Most administrators work very hard in meeting their responsibilities. I have the sense that they are paid for work done, that there is lots that ought to get looked at, that should be part of the criteria for judgment. Ifs should be raised and matters for review outlined. If we start messing around, however, problems can arise. 9) Professor Huang (Educational Technology, York) - "We in the colleges rely on the CUNY mail system and it is not at the tops in performance. In fact, there have been losses here - even two trucks were lost or missing for extended periods of time so that people have had to go out for help. There is a need for attention to this."/ It is the first I have heard of it. I thought our mail worked about as well as the US Postal Service. 10) Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) - "As a member of many search committees to bring people to CUNY we have found that the availability of housing in New York City is a major obstacle. Do you have any plans in this area?"/ That is an old issue. Many people have tried, I had experience with retired faculty at Queens fifteen years ago. Then, there were many options which no longer exist. For example, Mitchell Lama housing is no longer available. Last year we tried to do something for graduate students. Vice Chancellor Farley indicates that by the time we entered the market, it went bust. When NYU built, it did so many years ago and, in fact, there are some CUNY professors, since retired, living there still. Five or six years ago empties in that housing provided the opportunity for them to acquire apartments when NYU came to us and asked for help in filling those empties. I mention this only as a reminder of the rapid change that has taken place. There is no question of that now because of the present shortage. But I think that we are looking now at a softening and within 18 months there may be a change again. I can't get the money now in federal dollars, I can't get it for upper middle class housing. We also need to determine who is going to live there and I don't think it is really going to be easier. 11) Professor Davidson (Data Processing, La Guardia) - "After discussing at the reception the other day for Dr. Lythcott with him and President Harleston who have been looking into that area, I learned that they have found a number of possibilities in the environs of City College as the result of real delving. If we looked elsewhere too we might perhaps through the Graduate Center put some people to work to explore this and project possibilities. I hope that you may be able to discuss this with President Proshansky."/ That is a good idea.

VII. (bis) New Business: Professor Wedeen called again for new business. Professor Davidson announced that there would be a Computer Users Group Fair - material pertinent to which might be found with the materials distributed at this meeting. He said that there has been a proliferation of use of computers in the University so a series of new groups - 18 in number - have been organized to assist in this area. The document distributed may be useful since it indicates those groups. Professor Davidson asked the assistance of the Senate membership in publicizing this information.

Professor Huang (Educational Technology, York) said that his college would host a major conference on computer literacy on March 26 and March 27, 1987.

There being no further new business, Chair Wedeen declared the meeting adjourned, and the membership dispersed to meetings of the Senate's Standing Committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis  
Executive Director